

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/976,768	JENKINS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chuong D. Ngo	2193	

All Participants:

(1) Chuong D. Ngo.

(2) Christopher M. Tucker.

Date of Interview: 26 February 2010

Type of Interview:

☐ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Kobayashi (5,463,472).

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The examiner informed applicant's representative that the current claim 1 does not include the features that an I/O controller, video controller, and audio controller are included in the core computer unit, and that the core computer unit does not have a power supply. These features were added into claim 1 in the amendment filed on 09/09/2005 to overcome a rejection based on Kobayashi. Without these features, the current claim 1 should have been rejected based on Kobayashi. The examiner suggested adding back these feature into claim 1 to distinguish the claimed invention from Kobayashi. Applicant's representative agreed to so by an examiner's amendment.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)